



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,260	06/23/2003	Eric Berg	OIC0050US	1943
60975 7590 02/13/2008 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758			EXAMINER SANDON, WILLIAM V	
			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/13/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/602,260

Applicant(s)

BERG ET AL.

Examiner

William V. Saindon

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following NON FINAL Office Action is in response to Applicant's submission received June 23, 2003. Claims 1-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the claims are drawn to a "computer readable medium," which according to the specification includes "any type of media suitable for storing electronic instructions" (Specification at 6), and "propagated signals" (Specification at 8). Therefore, the claims are drawn to a non-statutory category.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flores et al. (US 5,630,069) (hereinafter Flores).

As to claim 1, Flores discloses a method comprising:
identifying an application product (see col. 1, lines 7-18, noting that the application can be for consulting, analysts, and app developers); and
associating a business process model pertaining to the application product with a plurality of views illustrating a business process within the application product (see id., noting that graphical tools map the business process; col. 11, lines 10-21, noting the various views available).

As to claim 2, Flores discloses each of the plurality of views is an image representing one of a plurality of user interfaces defined by the application product (see col. 1, lines 7-18, noting that the user interface is graphical, which provides an image for each view).

As to claim 3, Flores discloses creating the business process model for the application product using data from an external file (see col. 10, lines 53-62, noting that the business model created in the user interface can be opened from an existing, external file via a standard FILE menu).

As to claim 4, Flores discloses the business process model is created in a modeling language (see col. 5, line 60 et seq., noting the particular commands in the language used to model business processes).

As to claim 5, Flores discloses the business process model comprises graphical representations of a plurality of activities within the business process (see col. 6, lines 62-64, noting that activities are modeled using workflows defining acts).

As to claim 6, Flores discloses displaying the business process model with the plurality of views to the user (see col. 11, lines 10-21, noting the various views available to the user).

As to claim 7, Flores discloses:

creating the plurality of views corresponding to a plurality of user interfaces defined in the application product (see id., noting that the various views must be created in order for a user to view them);

storing an identifier of each of the plurality of views in a repository (see id., noting that the menu stores a plurality of views to choose from); and

associating, in the repository, the identifier of each of the plurality of views with at least one of a plurality of activities represented in the business process model (see id., noting that each activity on the map is associated with each view).

As to claim 8, Flores discloses the application product is a standard application product defined for a specific industry (see col. 1, lines 7-18, noting that the specific industry of consulting is chosen, with the standard application of consulting).

As to claim 9, Flores discloses a method comprising:

displaying a business process model pertaining to an application product (see col. 1, lines 7-18, noting that the business process is graphically displayed);

displaying a plurality of views illustrating a business process within the application product (see col. 11, lines 10-21, noting that various views may be selected; col. 12, lines 56-67, noting the various view options).

Claim 10 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 2.

Claim 11 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 4.

As to claims 12-14, Flores discloses deleting, adding, and replacing one of the plurality of views in response to a user request (see col. 10, line 66, noting that a user can do the standard cut, copy, paste, delete to objects in a view, thereby deleting, adding, and replacing the view).

As to claim 15, Flores discloses:

receiving a user request to navigate to one of the plurality of views in the application product (see col. 12, lines 56-67, noting the user can request any of the enumerated views from the menu);

determining a view identifier (see id., noting that each view is given a view identifier for the user to select from); and

passing a command to the application product to trigger display of a user interface associated with the view identifier in execution mode (see id., noting that the user selects the view and that selection command is executed by the program to display the selected view).

As to claim 16, Flores discloses:

creating a first set of business requirements using the business process model (see col. 3, lines 18-24, noting that a workflow map is created for a business process); and

transferring the first set of business requirements to a business requirement database (see col. 4, lines 53-57, noting that the workflow records are stored in a database).

As to claim 17, Flores discloses:

modifying the business process model in response to a user request (see col. 12, lines 46-55, noting the user can edit the business process);

creating a second set of business requirements using the modified business process model (see id., noting the paste function creates a second set copied from a first set); and

transferring the second set of business requirements to the business requirement database (see col. 12, line 25, noting the user can save the map to the database).

As to claim 18, Flores discloses maintaining existing relationships between components of the business process model when creating the first set of business requirements (see col. 4, lines 1-7, noting that workflows are linked by their relationships among one another).

Claim 19 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 8.

Claims 20-23 are rejected for similar reasons as claims 1-4.

Claims 24-29 are rejected for similar reasons as claims 7-12.

Claim 30 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 15.

Claims 31-35 are rejected for similar reasons as claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, respectively.

Claims 36-37 are rejected for similar reasons as claims 1-2, noting that Flores is practiced on a computer, having a processor and software executable to carry out the aforementioned methods. See e.g. Fig. 3, noting the various hardware components.

Claims 38-40 are rejected for similar reasons as claims 4, 12, and 15, respectively.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892, but note particularly the following:

Lautzenheiser et al. (US 6,023,572) disclose a model of activities of people in an organization, graphically.

Huang et al. (US 5,953,707) disclose a system that models and displays business processes such as demand management.

Bierenbaum (US 6,970,844) discloses a system that models and displays process maps.

Boden et al. (US 6,308,161) disclose a system representing business processes in a traversable 3-dimensional navigation space.

Agrawal et al. (US 6,038,538) disclose generating process models from workflow logs with a graphical display.

Walsh et al. (US 6,920,474) disclose a method for visually programming a process.

Metal et al. (US 7,184,967) disclose a graphical user interface of a business process workflow scheduling program.


Berg et al. (US 2004/0027388) disclose a method to facilitate development of a business process model, graphically.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William V. Saindon whose telephone number is (571) 270-3026. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5; alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/wvs/



TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISING PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600